

M-brane dynamical symmetry and quantization

Jens Hoppe *

Department of Mathematics,
Royal Institute of Technology,
KTH, 100 44 Stockholm,
Sweden

Abstract

The recently discovered dynamical symmetry for relativistic extended objects is derived from first principles, and analogous commutators are obtained for the corresponding formal quantum expressions

As shown in [1], Lorentz invariance implies the existence of a dynamical symmetry for M-branes, irrespective of the dimension; see also [4,6]. Deriving the corresponding commutation relations *directly* (rather than deducing them from a simple, though indirect, argument) is tedious, but turns out to reveal very interesting commutation relations for the various objects involved: the transverse embedding coordinates x_i and their canonical momenta p_i (constrained by $\int f^a \vec{p} \partial_a \vec{x}$ being zero whenever $\nabla_a f^a = 0$), x_- (here called ζ ; in the light-cone formulation to be reconstructed from $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{p}$) and the Hamiltonian density $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$. The main object of interest is ¹

*e-mail: hoppe@math.kth.se

¹for background details, see [1-6]; also note that I will only at the beginning write out the (unit weight) non-dynamical density ρ with respect to which (non-constant) orthonormal (eigen) functions (of a Laplacian Δ on the parameter space), $\{Y_\alpha\}_{\alpha=1}^\infty$, are introduced

$$M_{i-} := \int (x_i \tilde{\mathcal{H}} - \tilde{\zeta} p_i) d^M \varphi \quad (1)$$

$$x_i = X_i + x_{i\alpha} Y_\alpha, \quad p_i = \rho P_i + \tilde{p}_i$$

$$\tilde{\zeta} = Y_\alpha (d_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + e_{\alpha\beta\gamma}) \vec{x}_\beta \vec{p}_\gamma = 2 \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\infty} \frac{Y_\alpha}{\mu_\alpha} \int (\nabla^a Y_\alpha) \tilde{p} \partial_a \vec{x} d^M \varphi$$

$$d_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \int Y_\alpha Y_\beta Y_\gamma \rho d^M \varphi, \quad e_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \frac{\mu_\beta - \mu_\gamma}{\mu_\alpha} d_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$$

$$\frac{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}}{\rho} = Y_\alpha d_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \vec{p}_\beta \cdot \vec{p}_\gamma + Y_\alpha g_\alpha, \quad \Delta Y_\alpha = -\mu_\alpha Y_\alpha,$$

$$\frac{g}{\rho^2} = \frac{1}{\rho^2} \det(\partial_a \vec{x} \partial_b \vec{x})_{a,b=1,\dots,M} = g_\alpha Y_\alpha + \int g/\rho.$$

One of the crucial relations will be

$$\{\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\beta\} = (3d_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + e_{\alpha\beta\gamma}) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\gamma + 4\delta_{\alpha\beta} \mathbb{M}^2 \quad (2)$$

where

$$\mathbb{M}^2 = \vec{p}_\alpha \vec{p}_\alpha + \int g/\rho d^M \varphi \quad (3)$$

denotes the squared mass (a relativistically invariant quantity) of the extended object.

1 Poisson Brackets

When obtaining (2) (and the other relations stated below), I found it easiest to artificially (re)introduce zero-modes X_i , P_j , η , ζ_0 , writing

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\zeta} &= 2\eta(\zeta - \zeta_0) - 2\vec{P}(\vec{x} - \vec{X}) \\ \tilde{\mathcal{H}} &= 2\eta(\mathcal{H} - H) - 2\vec{P}(\vec{p} - \vec{P}) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with

$$\{\eta, \zeta_0\} = 1, \quad \{x_i(\varphi), p_j(\tilde{\varphi})\} = \delta_{ij} \delta(\varphi, \tilde{\varphi}) \quad (5)$$

$$\partial_a \zeta = \frac{\vec{p} \partial_a \vec{x}}{\eta \rho}, \quad \dot{\zeta} = \frac{\vec{p}^2 + g}{2\eta^2 \rho^2}. \quad (6)$$

So (on the r.h.s. always working modulo zero-modes, as the l.h.s. does not contain any; hence knowing that they *have* to cancel/drop out) e.g. (from now on not writing out factors of ρ)

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, \tilde{T}_\epsilon = d_{\epsilon\beta\gamma}\vec{p}_\beta\vec{p}_\gamma\} &= 2\{\eta\zeta_\alpha - \vec{P}\vec{x}_\alpha, \int Y_\epsilon\vec{p}^2 - 2\vec{P}\vec{p}_\epsilon\} \\
&\longrightarrow \frac{2}{\mu_\alpha}\{\int (\nabla^a Y_\alpha)\vec{p}\partial_a\vec{x}, \int Y_\epsilon\vec{p}^2\} = -\frac{4}{\mu_\alpha}\int \nabla_a((\nabla^a Y_\alpha)\vec{p})Y_\epsilon\vec{p} \\
&= -\frac{4}{\mu_\alpha}\int (-\mu_\alpha Y_\alpha\vec{p} + \nabla^a Y_\alpha\nabla_a\vec{p})Y_\epsilon\vec{p} = 4\int Y_\alpha Y_\epsilon\vec{p}^2 - \frac{2}{\mu_\alpha}\int (\nabla^a Y_\alpha)Y_\epsilon\partial_a Y_\beta\int Y_\beta\vec{p}^2 \\
&\implies 4\delta_{\alpha\epsilon}\vec{p}_\gamma\vec{p}_\gamma + (e_{\alpha\epsilon\beta} - d_{\alpha\epsilon\beta})\tilde{T}_\beta + 4d_{\alpha\epsilon\beta}\tilde{T}_\beta \\
&= (3d_{\alpha\epsilon\beta} + e_{\alpha\epsilon\beta})\tilde{T}_\beta + 4\delta_{\alpha\epsilon}\vec{p}_\gamma\vec{p}_\gamma = \{\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, \tilde{T}_\epsilon\} \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, g_\beta\} &= \{\frac{2}{\mu_\alpha}\int (\nabla^a Y_\alpha)\vec{p}\partial_a\vec{x}, \int Y_\beta g\} = \frac{4}{\mu_\alpha}\int (\nabla^c Y_\alpha)\partial_c\vec{x}\partial_a(Y_\beta g g^{ab}\partial_b\vec{x}) \\
&= 4\int Y_\alpha Y_\beta g - \frac{4}{\mu_\alpha}\int \nabla^c Y_\alpha Y_\beta g g^{ab}\underbrace{\partial_{ac}^2\vec{x}\partial_b\vec{x}}_{=\frac{1}{2}\partial_c g_{ab}} \\
&= 4\delta_{\alpha\beta}\int g + 4d_{\alpha\beta\gamma}g_\gamma + \frac{2}{\mu_\alpha}\int \nabla_c(\nabla^c Y_\alpha Y_\beta)g \\
&= 4\delta_{\alpha\beta}\int g + 4d_{\alpha\beta\gamma}g_\gamma - 2d_{\alpha\beta\epsilon}g_\epsilon + \underbrace{\frac{2}{\mu_\alpha}\int (\nabla^c Y_\alpha)Y_\epsilon\nabla_c Y_\beta g_\epsilon}_{=-(e_{\alpha\epsilon\beta}-d_{\alpha\epsilon\beta})g_\epsilon=(+e_{\alpha\beta\epsilon}+d_{\alpha\beta\epsilon})g_\epsilon} \\
&= 4\delta_{\alpha\beta}\int g + 3d_{\alpha\beta\epsilon}g_\epsilon + e_{\alpha\beta\epsilon}g_\epsilon = \{\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, g_\beta\},
\end{aligned}$$

proving (2).

In the same manner one can see that

$$x_{i\alpha}x_{j\alpha'}\{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\alpha, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\alpha'}\} + ((\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha)x_{i\beta}\{p_{j\alpha}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\beta\} - (i \leftrightarrow j)) = 0 \tag{8}$$

and

$$\{\int \tilde{\zeta}p_i, \int \tilde{\zeta}p_j\} = 0. \tag{9}$$

Namely,

$$\{\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\alpha, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\alpha'}\} = \left\{ \int Y_\alpha(2\eta(\mathcal{H}-H)-2\vec{P}(\vec{p}-\vec{P})), \int Y_{\alpha'}(2\eta(\mathcal{H}-H)-2\vec{P}(\vec{p}-\vec{P})) \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \rightarrow 4\eta^2 \left\{ \int \mathcal{H}_\alpha, \int \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'} \right\} \\
& \rightarrow 4 \int (Y_\alpha \partial_a Y_{\alpha'} - Y_{\alpha'} \partial_a Y_\alpha) g g^{ab} \underbrace{\tilde{p} \partial_b \vec{x}}_{=\frac{1}{2} \partial_b \tilde{\zeta}}, \tag{10}
\end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\int \int x_i(\varphi) x_j(\tilde{\varphi}) \{ \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\varphi), \tilde{\mathcal{H}}(\tilde{\varphi}) \} \approx 2 \int (x_i \partial_a x_j - x_j \partial_a x_i) g g^{ab} \partial_b \tilde{\zeta} \rho d^M \varphi \tag{11}$$

The remaining term(s) in (8) however, are

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int \tilde{\zeta}(\tilde{\varphi}) x_i(\varphi) \{ p_j(\tilde{\varphi}), g(\varphi) \} - (i \leftrightarrow j) \\
& = +2 \int \tilde{\zeta}(\varphi) \partial_a (x_i g g^{ab} \partial_b x_j) - (i \leftrightarrow j) \\
& = -2 \int \partial_a \tilde{\zeta} x_i g g^{ab} \partial_b x_j - (i \leftrightarrow j), \tag{12}
\end{aligned}$$

canceling (11) (hence proving (8)). (9) easily follows when using

$$\{ \tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, \vec{p}_\beta \} = (d_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + e_{\alpha\beta\gamma}) \vec{p}_\gamma \tag{13}$$

and (already proven in [1], see also [3])

$$\{ \tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, \tilde{\zeta}_\beta \} \approx 2e_{[\alpha\beta]\gamma} \tilde{\zeta}_\gamma \tag{14}$$

-the relations generalizing those of the Witt-algebra of the string to arbitrary dimensions. The only missing part of having thus (directly) proven

$$\{ M_{i-}, M_{j-} \} = 4\mathbb{M}^2 M_{ij}, \quad M_{ij} := x_{i\alpha} p_{j\alpha} - x_{j\alpha} p_{i\beta} \tag{15}$$

is the observation that

$$\{ \tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, \vec{x}_\beta \} = (-d_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + e_{\alpha\beta\gamma}) \vec{x}_\gamma \tag{16}$$

implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& p_{j\alpha} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\beta \{ \tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, x_{i\beta} \} - (i \leftrightarrow j) \\
& = (x_{i\gamma} p_{j\alpha} - x_{j\gamma} p_{i\alpha}) (-d_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + e_{\alpha\beta\gamma}) \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\beta, \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

and that

$$x_{i\alpha}\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\alpha'}\{d_{\alpha\beta\gamma}\vec{p}_\beta\vec{p}_\gamma, x_{j\alpha'}\} - (i \leftrightarrow j) = -2d_{\alpha\alpha'\gamma}(x_{i\alpha}p_{j\gamma} - x_{j\alpha}p_{i\gamma})\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\alpha'} \quad (18)$$

i.e. (17)+(18) canceling both the d-terms, as well as the e-term in $p_{j\alpha}x_{i\beta}\{\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\beta\} - (i \leftrightarrow j)$.

Coming back to (2), note that (in particular) for fixed $\alpha = \beta$ one has

$$\{\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\alpha\} = 4\mathbb{M}^2 + (3d_{\alpha\alpha\gamma} + e_{\alpha\alpha\gamma})\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\gamma \quad (19)$$

and that one also has (for arbitrary, fixed, α)

$$\begin{aligned} \{\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, \mathbb{M}^2\} &= 2\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\alpha, & \{\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, \{\tilde{\zeta}_\alpha, \mathbb{M}^2\}\} &= 4\mathbb{M}^2 + (3d_{\alpha\alpha\gamma} + e_{\alpha\alpha\gamma})\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_\gamma \\ \{\tilde{x}_\alpha, \mathbb{M}^2\} &= 2\vec{p}_\alpha, & \{\vec{p}_\alpha, \mathbb{M}^2\} &= 2(\Delta\vec{x})_\alpha \end{aligned}$$

2 Commutators

To derive corresponding relations for a quantized theory of relativistic extended objects is very difficult; though *formally* possible, when organized with the help of the equations derived above (in particular: (2), (8), (9), (11)-(18)). There are several differences compared to the classical case:

- an ordering prescription has to be chosen at the beginning for the generators to be (at least formally) hermitean
- the expressions obtained after using the basic commutation relations quite often have to be reordered (in order to allow for cancelations present in the classical calculations)
- special care has to be taken when using the constraints

The final step, as essential as difficult (namely: renormalizing / making sure that the expressions one works with are well defined for arbitrary M (in string theory furnished by normal ordering of the oscillator modes; for M=2 one could e.g. combine the calculations below with finite N matrix regularization)/ remains.

Before going into details, concerning

$$\left[\int (x_i \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H} x_i - \zeta p_i - p_i \zeta), \int (x_j \mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H} x_j - \zeta p_j - p_j \zeta) \right] \quad (20)$$

let me remark that there are, despite the high degree of non-linearity (from $\mathcal{H}$), and non-locality (from ζ) a number of *simplifying* features:

- $\mathcal{H}$ is a sum of "pure" terms (one depending only on the momenta, the other only on the coordinates)
- as ζ is linear in x and p , its naive commutator with any "pure" term (and also with itself) does not involve any complicated ordering questions. All relevant Poisson-brackets involving ζ easily carry over to (formal) quantum relations (cp.[3])

As the definition of the purely internal quantum ζ let us take

$$\zeta_\alpha = \frac{1}{2}(d_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + e_{\alpha\beta\gamma})(\vec{x}_\beta \vec{p}_\gamma + \vec{p}_\gamma \vec{x}_\beta) + z_\alpha \quad (21)$$

-which is formally hermitean (the real constants z_α are put in for safety, resp. generality; due to the infinite sums care must be taken concerning possible divergencies

The classical expression [7]

$$\zeta = \zeta_0 + \frac{1}{\eta} \int G(\varphi, \tilde{\varphi}) \tilde{\nabla}^a \left(\frac{\vec{p}}{\rho} \partial_a \vec{x} \right) \quad (22)$$

implies (" $\rho = 1$ ")

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_c(\eta\zeta) &= \vec{p} \partial_c \vec{x} - \int (\partial_c \tilde{\nabla}^a G + \delta_c^a \delta(\varphi, \tilde{\varphi})) \vec{p} \partial_a \vec{x} \\ &= \vec{p} \partial_c \vec{x} - \int F_c^a(\varphi, \tilde{\varphi}) \vec{p} \tilde{\partial}_a \vec{x} d^M \tilde{\varphi} \approx \vec{p} \partial_c \vec{x} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

as F is divergence-free, $\tilde{\nabla}_a F_c^a(\varphi, \tilde{\varphi}) = 0$. Similarly one may take $\hat{\zeta} := \zeta_\alpha Y_\alpha(\varphi)$ to satisfy

$$\partial_c \hat{\zeta} = \left(\tilde{p} \partial_c \vec{x} - \int F_c^a \vec{p} \partial_a \vec{x} \right) + h.c. + \partial_c z. \quad (24)$$

Just as in eq. (25) of [1] (there for the classical case) it is easy to argue that

$$\begin{aligned} -i[\zeta_\alpha, \zeta_{\alpha'}] &= \int Y_{[\alpha\alpha']}^c \tilde{p} \partial_c \vec{x} d^M \varphi + h.c. \\ &= \int Y_{[\alpha\alpha']}^c (\partial_c \zeta + \left(\int F_c^a (\vec{p} \partial_a \vec{x}) + h.c. \right) - \partial_c z) \\ &= 2e_{[\alpha\alpha']\epsilon} \zeta_\epsilon + \int \int F_c^a Y_{[\alpha\alpha']}^c (\vec{p} \partial_a \vec{x} + h.c.) - 2e_{[\alpha\alpha']\epsilon} z_\epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where

$$Y_{[\alpha\alpha']}^c = \frac{2}{\mu_\alpha \mu_{\alpha'}} (\nabla^b Y_\alpha \nabla_b \nabla^c Y_{\alpha'} - (\alpha \longleftrightarrow \alpha')); \quad (26)$$

while the second term in the last r.h.s. of (25) is zero when acting on the physical (constrained) Hilbert space, (25) also appears sandwiched between 2 momentum modes when trying to prove the quantum analogue of (9):

$$\begin{aligned} & [\zeta_\alpha p_{i\alpha} + p_{i\alpha} \zeta_\alpha, \zeta_{\alpha'} p_{j\alpha'} + p_{j\alpha'} \zeta_{\alpha'}] \\ &= [\zeta_\alpha p_{i\alpha}, \zeta_{\alpha'} p_{j\alpha'}] - [\zeta_\alpha, p_{j\alpha'}] + ([\zeta_\alpha p_{i\alpha}, p_{j\alpha'} \zeta_{\alpha'}] - (i \leftrightarrow j)). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Due to

$$[\zeta_\alpha, \vec{p}_\beta] = i(d_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + e_{\alpha\beta\gamma})\vec{p}_\gamma \quad (28)$$

and (25) the first two terms of (27) give

$$\begin{aligned} & \zeta_\alpha [p_{i\alpha}, \zeta_{\alpha'}] p_{j\alpha'} + ([\zeta_\alpha, \zeta_{\alpha'}] p_{j\alpha'} + \zeta_{\alpha'} [\zeta_\alpha, p_{j\alpha'}]) p_{i\alpha} - h.c. \\ & \approx -i(d_{\alpha'\alpha\epsilon} + e_{\alpha'\alpha\epsilon}) \zeta_\alpha p_{i\epsilon} p_{j\alpha'} + i(e_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon} - e_{\alpha'\alpha\epsilon}) (\zeta_\epsilon - z_\epsilon) p_{j\alpha'} p_{i\alpha} \\ & \quad + i(d_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon} + e_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon}) \zeta_{\alpha'} p_{j\epsilon} p_{i\alpha} - h.c. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The two d-terms trivially cancel, and the $e\zeta pp$ terms due to $e_{\alpha(\beta\gamma)} = 0$, resulting in only

$$-4ie_{[\alpha\alpha']\epsilon} z_\epsilon p_{i\alpha} p_{j\alpha'} \quad (30)$$

remaining.

More difficult is the second part in (27),

$$\zeta_\alpha p_{j\alpha'} [p_{i\alpha}, \zeta_{\alpha'}] + ([\zeta_\alpha, p_{j\alpha'}] \zeta_{\alpha'} + p_{j\alpha'} [\zeta_\alpha, \zeta_{\alpha'}]) p_{i\alpha} - (i \leftrightarrow j). \quad (31)$$

Writing in the first term $\zeta_\alpha p_{j\alpha'} = p_{j\alpha'} \zeta_\alpha + [\zeta_\alpha, p_{j\alpha'}]$, and noting that

$$[\zeta_\alpha, p_{j\alpha'}] [p_{i\alpha}, \zeta_{\alpha'}] - (i \leftrightarrow j) = [[\zeta_\alpha, p_{j\alpha'}], [p_{i\alpha}, \zeta_{\alpha'}]] = 0 \quad (32)$$

(as each entry of the last commutator is a finite sum of momenta) all terms are of the form $p\zeta p$, namely:

$$\begin{aligned} & -ip_{j\alpha'} \zeta_\alpha (d_{\alpha'\alpha\epsilon} + e_{\alpha'\alpha\epsilon}) p_{i\epsilon} + i(d_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon} + e_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon}) p_{j\epsilon} \zeta_{\alpha'} p_{i\alpha} \\ & + ip_{j\alpha'} (e_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon} - e_{\alpha'\alpha\epsilon}) (\zeta_\epsilon - z_\epsilon) p_{i\alpha} + ip_{j\alpha'} \phi_{[\alpha\alpha']} p_{i\alpha} - (i \leftrightarrow j) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

where

$$\phi_{[\alpha\alpha']} = \int \int F_c^a(\varphi, \tilde{\varphi}) Y_{[\alpha\alpha']}^c(\varphi) (\tilde{p} \partial_a \vec{x} + h.c.) (\tilde{\varphi}). \quad (34)$$

While again the d-terms are canceling trivially, and the e-terms via $e_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + e_{\alpha\gamma\beta} = 0$, leaving again $-4ie_{[\alpha\alpha']\epsilon} z_\epsilon p_{i\alpha} p_{j\alpha'}$, the potentially most dangerous term is the one proportional to

$$p_{j\alpha'} \phi_{[\alpha\alpha']} p_{i\alpha} - (i \leftrightarrow j). \quad (35)$$

While $[\phi, p]$ is linear in p (hence possibly of the form (30)) it could be infinite. The following argument however renders (35) finite (in fact: zero):

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2(p_{j\alpha'}\phi_{\alpha\alpha'}p_{i\alpha} - (i \leftrightarrow j)) \\
&= \phi p_j p_i + [p_j, \phi]p_i + p_j p_i \phi + p_{j\alpha'}[\phi, p_i] + \phi p_i p_j + [p_{i\alpha}, \phi_{\alpha\alpha'}]p_j \\
&\quad + p_{i\alpha}p_{j\alpha'}\phi_{\alpha\alpha'} + p_{i\alpha}[\phi_{\alpha\alpha'}, p_{j\alpha'}] \\
&= 2\phi_{\alpha\alpha'}p_{i\alpha}p_{j\alpha'} + 2p_{i\alpha}p_{j\alpha'}\phi_{\alpha\alpha'} + [p_{i\alpha}, [\phi_{\alpha\alpha'}, p_{j\alpha'}]] + [p_{j\alpha'}, [\phi_{\alpha\alpha'}, p_{i\alpha}]]
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

While the first two terms vanish between physical states, the inner commutators in the last two terms are independent of x , causing (36) to vanish for each α, α' .

A similar analysis works for the terms linear in p , and of degree $2M + 1$ in x , as well as $\sim x_i x_j$ ($\rightarrow$ again indicating “modulo terms containing the total momentum $\vec{P}$ ”; those terms have to work out just as in the classical theory, as $\vec{X}$ does not appear):

$$\begin{aligned}
& [\int Y_\alpha \left(\frac{\vec{p}^2 + g}{\rho} \right), \int Y_{\alpha'}(\tilde{\varphi}) \frac{\widetilde{\vec{p}^2 + g}}{\rho} d^M \tilde{\varphi}] \\
&= \int \int Y_\alpha(\varphi) Y_{\alpha'}(\tilde{\varphi}) \left(\frac{\vec{p}}{\rho} [\vec{p}, \tilde{g}] + [\vec{p}, \tilde{g}] \frac{\vec{p}}{\rho} \right) - (\alpha \leftrightarrow \alpha') \\
&= 2i \int (Y_\alpha \partial_a Y_{\alpha'} - Y_{\alpha'} \partial_a Y_\alpha) (\vec{p} \partial_b \vec{x} g g^{ab} + g g^{ab} \partial_b \vec{x} \cdot \vec{p}) \\
&= 2i \int (Y_\alpha \partial_a Y_{\alpha'} - Y_{\alpha'} \partial_a Y_\alpha) ((\vec{p} \partial_b \vec{x} + \partial_b \vec{x} \vec{p}) g g^{ab} + g g^{ab} (\partial_b \vec{x} \cdot \vec{p} + \vec{p} \partial_b \vec{x})) d^M \varphi \\
&\rightarrow i \int (Y_\alpha \partial_a Y_{\alpha'} - Y_{\alpha'} \partial_a Y_\alpha) ((\partial_b \hat{\zeta} + \phi_b) g g^{ab} + g g^{ab} (\partial_b \hat{\zeta} + \phi_b)) = [\mathcal{H}_\alpha, \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}]
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

where

$$\phi_b := \int F_b^c(\varphi, \tilde{\varphi}) (\tilde{p} \partial_c \vec{x} + \partial_c \vec{x} \cdot \tilde{p}) (\tilde{\varphi}) d^M \tilde{\varphi}, \tag{38}$$

(24) was used (with $z \equiv 0$), and the fact that $\vec{p} \partial_b \vec{x}$ and $\partial_b \vec{x} \cdot \vec{p}$ commute with

$$g g^{ab} = \frac{1}{(M-1)!} \epsilon^{aa_2 \dots a_M} \epsilon^{bb_2 \dots b_M} g_{a_2 b_2} \dots g_{a_M b_M} \tag{39}$$

- the reason being that

$$\vec{p} \partial_b \vec{x} g_{a_n b_n} = \sum_j p_j \partial_b x_j \partial_{a_n} x_j \partial_{b_n} x_j + \sum_j \sum_{k \neq j} p_j \partial_b x_j \partial_{a_n} x_k \partial_{b_n} x_k; \tag{40}$$

(the first sum vanishing upon contraction with $\epsilon^{bb_2 \dots b_M}$, while in the second one all operators commute).

It is also easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned} [p_{j\alpha'}, \mathcal{H}_\alpha] &= \int \int Y_{\alpha'}(\tilde{\varphi}) Y_{\alpha(\varphi)} [p_j(\tilde{\varphi}), g(\varphi)] = 2i \int Y_{\alpha'} \partial_a (Y_\alpha g g^{ab} \partial_b x_j) \\ &= -2i \int Y_\alpha \partial_a Y_{\alpha'} g g^{ab} \partial_b x_j \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Inserting (37) and (41) into

$$\begin{aligned} &x_{i\alpha} x_{j\alpha'} [\mathcal{H}_\alpha, \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}] + [\mathcal{H}_\alpha, \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}] x_{i\alpha} x_{j\alpha'} \\ &+ x_{i\alpha} [\mathcal{H}_\alpha, \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}] x_{j\alpha'} + x_{j\alpha'} [\mathcal{H}_\alpha, \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}] x_{i\alpha} \\ &x_{i\alpha} (\zeta_\alpha [p_{j\alpha'}, \mathcal{H}_\alpha] + [p_{j\alpha'}, \mathcal{H}_\alpha] \zeta_{\alpha'}) + (\zeta_{\alpha'} [p_{j\alpha'}, \mathcal{H}_\alpha] + [p_{j\alpha'}, \mathcal{H}_\alpha] \zeta_{\alpha'}) x_{i\alpha} - (i \leftrightarrow j) \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

gives 16 terms of the form $x \partial x \partial \zeta g g^{ab}$ (in various orderings), from the $xx\mathcal{H}\mathcal{H}$ terms, and $2 \cdot 8$ $x \partial x \partial \zeta g g^{ab}$ terms (in various orderings) from $[p, \mathcal{H}]x\zeta$ terms - which all cancel each other (when using again that $\partial_a \zeta + \phi_b$ commutes with $g g^{ab}$, cp. (40)) - and the remaining terms (involving the constraints) being (i times)

$$2x_i \partial x_j g g^{ab} \phi + 2\phi g g^{ab} x_i \partial x_j + 2x_i \phi \partial x_j g g^{ab} + 2g g^{ab} \partial x_j \phi x_i - (i \leftrightarrow j). \quad (43)$$

In analogy with (36) the first two terms in (43) vanish between physical states, while

$$\begin{aligned} &2x_i \phi_b \partial_a x_j g g^{ab} + 2g g^{ab} \partial_a x_j \phi_b x_i - (i \leftrightarrow j) \\ &= \phi_b x_i \partial_a x_j g g^{ab} + [x_i, \phi_b] \partial_a x_j g g^{ab} + x_i [\phi_b, \partial_a x_j g g^{ab}] + x_i \partial_a x_j g g^{ab} \phi_b \\ &+ g g^{ab} \partial_a x_j [\phi_b, x_i] + g g^{ab} \partial_a x_j x_i \phi_b + \phi_b g g^{ab} \partial_a x_j x_i + [g g^{ab} \partial_a x_j, \phi_b] x_i - (i \leftrightarrow j) \\ &\approx [[x_i, \phi_b], \partial_a x_j g g^{ab}] + [x_i, [\phi_b, \partial_a x_j g g^{ab}]] - (i \leftrightarrow j) \\ &= 2[[x_i, \phi_b], \partial_a x_j g g^{ab}] - (i \leftrightarrow j) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, in order to calculate all the terms containing $x_i p_j - (i \leftrightarrow j)$ let us first note that (up to a possible redefinition of $\mathbb{M}^2$ by a constant - which would, just like in the standard treatment of strings, directly result in a central extension) the classical relation (2), derived above, carries over identically to the quantum case:

$$-i[\zeta_\alpha, \mathcal{H}_\beta] = (3d_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + e_{\alpha\beta\gamma}) \mathcal{H}_\gamma + 4\delta_{\alpha\beta} (\mathbb{M}^2 - c) + 4\delta_{\alpha\beta} c. \quad (44)$$

For the moment putting $c = 0$, the remaining cross terms

$$\begin{aligned}
& x_{i\alpha'}([\zeta_\alpha, \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}]p_{j\alpha} + p_{j\alpha}[\zeta_\alpha, \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}]) + ([\zeta_\alpha, \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}]p_{j\alpha} + p_{j\alpha}[\zeta_\alpha, \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}])x_{i\alpha'} \\
& + ([\zeta_\alpha, x_{i\alpha'}]p_{j\alpha} + p_{j\alpha}[\zeta_\alpha, x_{i\alpha'}])\mathcal{H}_{\alpha'} + \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}([\zeta_\alpha, x_{i\alpha'}]p_{j\alpha} + p_{j\alpha}[\zeta_\alpha, x_{i\alpha'}]) - (i \leftrightarrow j)
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

together with $x[\mathcal{H}, x]\mathcal{H}$ terms arising from $[\int(x_i\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H}x_i), \int(x_j\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H}x_j)]$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
& (x_{i\alpha}[\mathcal{H}_\alpha, x_{j\alpha'}]\mathcal{H}_{\alpha'} + x_{j\alpha'}[x_{i\alpha}, \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}]\mathcal{H}_\alpha) - (\dots)^\dagger \\
& + ([x_{i\alpha}, \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}]x_{j\alpha'}\mathcal{H}_\alpha + x_{i\alpha}\mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}[\mathcal{H}_\alpha, x_{j\alpha'}] - (i \leftrightarrow j))
\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

give (i times)

$$\begin{aligned}
& [(3d_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon} + e_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon})\{x_{i\alpha'}(\mathcal{H}_\epsilon p_{j\alpha} + p_{j\alpha}\mathcal{H}_\epsilon) + (\mathcal{H}_\epsilon p_{j\alpha} + p_{j\alpha}\mathcal{H}_\epsilon)x_{i\alpha'}\} \\
& + (-d_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon} + e_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon})\{(x_{i\epsilon}p_{j\alpha} + p_{j\alpha}x_{i\epsilon})\mathcal{H}_{\alpha'} + \mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}(x_{i\epsilon}p_{j\alpha} + p_{j\alpha}x_{i\epsilon})\} \\
& + 4\delta_{\alpha\alpha'}\{x_{i\alpha'}(\mathbb{M}^2 p_{j\alpha} + p_{j\alpha}\mathbb{M}^2) + (\mathbb{M}^2 p_{j\alpha} + p_{j\alpha}\mathbb{M}^2)x_{i\alpha'}\}] - (i \leftrightarrow j) \\
& - 2d_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon}\{x_{i\alpha'}p_{j\epsilon}\mathcal{H}_\alpha + \mathcal{H}_\alpha p_{j\epsilon}x_{i\alpha'} + p_{j\epsilon}x_{i\alpha'}\mathcal{H}_\alpha + x_{i\alpha}\mathcal{H}_{\alpha'}p_{j\epsilon} - (i \leftrightarrow j)\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

While the e-terms trivially cancel (due to $e_{\alpha(\alpha'\epsilon)} = 0$ and $e_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon}[x_{i\alpha'}, \mathcal{H}_\epsilon] = 0$), and the $\mathbb{M}^2$ terms being (i times)

$$8(\mathbb{M}_{ij}\mathbb{M}^2 + \mathbb{M}^2\mathbb{M}_{ij}), \tag{48}$$

the d-terms can be seen to cancel by using

$$d_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon}[x_{i\alpha'}, \mathcal{H}_\epsilon]p_{j\alpha} - (i \leftrightarrow j) = 2id_{\alpha\alpha'\epsilon}d_{\alpha'\epsilon\mu}p_{i\mu}p_{j\alpha} - (i \leftrightarrow j) = 0$$

(for each fixed α' , ϵ , due to $(\epsilon\mu)$ resp. $[ij]$ (anti)symmetry) which allows to move $\mathcal{H}$ to the very left or very right in the terms in (47) where it appears in the middle.

It then remains to check that

$$\begin{aligned}
& -4i\eta^2 \left[X_i H + H X_i - 2\zeta_0 P_i + 2\frac{\mathbb{M}_{ik}P_k}{\eta}, X_j H + H X_j - 2\zeta_0 P_j + 2\frac{\mathbb{M}_{jl}P_l}{\eta} \right] \\
& = -8(\mathbb{M}_{ij}\mathbb{M}^2 + \mathbb{M}^2\mathbb{M}_{ij})
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

and that the cross terms cancel

$$\left[X_i H + H X_i - 2\zeta_0 P_i + 2\frac{\mathbb{M}_{ik}P_k}{\eta}, \int(x_j\mathcal{H} + \mathcal{H}x_j - \zeta p_j - p_j\zeta) \right] - (i \leftrightarrow j) = 0 \tag{50}$$

3 Conclusion

The above calculations provide a step towards the quantization of higher-dimensional relativistic extended objects. While a priori neither M_{i-} , as defined above, nor $\mathcal{H}_\alpha$, ζ_α , $\dots$ need be well-defined, the considerations presented in this paper (showing no anomalies arising from the most naive ordering problems) should be helpful when considering regularizations/renormalizations/product expansions of the various operators involved.

Appendix

The difficulty of resolving the ambiguities (and potential singularities) present in (commutators of) functionals of $\vec{x}$ and $\vec{p}$ is e.g. illustrated by the celebrated Virasoro algebra calculation; due to

$$[\alpha_m^i, \alpha_n^j] = m\delta_{m+n,0} \quad (51)$$

being zero for $m+n \neq 0$ there are no ordering problems concerning

$$L_{n \neq 0} := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \vec{\alpha}_{n-k} \cdot \vec{\alpha}_k, \quad (52)$$

while using that

$$[\vec{\alpha}_m, L_{n \neq 0}] = m\alpha_{n+m} \quad (53)$$

one finds

$$[2L_{m \neq 0}, L_{n \neq 0}] = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (k\alpha_{m-k}\alpha_{k+n} + (m-k)\alpha_{m+n-k}\alpha_k). \quad (54)$$

Changing the summation index in the first sum, $k \rightarrow k-n$ would result in

$$(m-n) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \vec{\alpha}_{m+n-k} \vec{\alpha}_k \quad (55)$$

which is the desired answer $2(m-n)L_{m+n}$, if $m+n \neq 0$, but for $n = -m$ would give

$$2m \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \vec{\alpha}_{-k} \vec{\alpha}_k = 2m \left(\sum_{k>0} \vec{\alpha}_{-k} \cdot \vec{\alpha}_k + \vec{\alpha}_0^2 + \sum_{k<0} (\vec{\alpha}_k \cdot \vec{\alpha}_{-k} + [\vec{\alpha}_{-k}, \vec{\alpha}_k]) \right), \quad (56)$$

corresponding to the fact that

$$\left[\int_0^{2\pi} e^{in\varphi} (\vec{p}^2 + \vec{x}'^2 - \vec{p}\vec{x}' - \vec{x}'\vec{p}), \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-in\tilde{\varphi}} (\vec{p}^2 + \vec{x}'^2 - \vec{p}\vec{x}' - \vec{x}'\vec{p})(\tilde{\varphi}) \right] \quad (57)$$

by a naive calculation (missing $\delta'''(\varphi, \tilde{\varphi})$) would be proportional to

$$\int_0^{2\pi} n(\vec{p}^2 + \vec{x}'^2) d\varphi \quad (58)$$

which does *not* differ from (n times)

$$2L_0 = \vec{\alpha}_0^2 + 2 \sum_{l>0} \vec{\alpha}_{-l} \vec{\alpha}_l \quad (59)$$

by a finite constant proportional to $m(m^2 - 1)$.

To actually obtain the desired $2mL_0 + \frac{2d}{12}m(m^2 - 1)$ one could proceed from (54) _{$n=-m$} as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_k (k\alpha_{m-k}\alpha_{k-m} + (m-k)\alpha_{-k}\alpha_k) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq m} k\alpha_{m-k}\alpha_{k-m} + \sum_{k < m} k(\alpha_{k-m}\alpha_{m-k} + [\vec{\alpha}_{m-k}, \vec{\alpha}_{k-m}]) \\ & \quad + \sum_{k \geq 0} (m-k)\alpha_{-k}\alpha_k + \sum_{k < 0} (m-k)(\alpha_k\alpha_{-k} + [\vec{\alpha}_{-k}, \vec{\alpha}_k]) \\ &= \sum_{l \geq 0} (m+l)\alpha_{-l}\alpha_l + \sum_{l > 0} (m-l)\alpha_{-l}\alpha_l + \sum_{l \geq 0} (m-l)\alpha_{-l}\alpha_l + \sum_{l > 0} (m+l)\alpha_{-l}\alpha_l \\ & \quad + d \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} k(m-k) = \\ &= 2m \left(\vec{\alpha}_0^2 + 2 \sum_{l>0} \vec{\alpha}_{-l} \vec{\alpha}_l \right) + \frac{d}{6} m(m^2 - 1) \quad (60) \end{aligned}$$

i.e. changing summation indicies ($k = m + l$, $k = m - l$, $k = l$, $k = -l$, respectively) only in normal-ordered terms (and not in the commutator/c-number/ terms)

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank G.Arutyunov, M.Bordemann, B.Durhuus, J.Goldstone, S.Theisen, and M.Trzetrzelewski for discussions.

References

- [1] J. Hoppe, *Fundamental structures of M(brane) theory*, Phys.Lett.B 695 (2011) 384, doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.11.038 arXiv:1003.5189 hep-th.
- [2] J.Hoppe Quantum theory of a massless relativistic surface and a two-dimensional bound state problem PhD Thesis MIT 1982 (<http://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/15717>) See also Membranes and matrix models, arXiv:hep-th/0206192 (IHES/P/02/47) and references therein.
- [3] J. Hoppe, *Quantum Reconstruction Algebras*, <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:kth:diva-13591>
- [4] J.de Woul, J. Hoppe, D.Lundholm, M.Sundin *A dynamical symmetry for supermembranes*, arXiv:1004.0266 hep-th.
- [5] J.de Woul, J. Hoppe, D.Lundholm, *Partial Hamiltonian reduction of relativistic extended objects in light-cone gauge*, arXiv:hep-th/0206192.
- [6] J.Hoppe, *Matrix Models and Lorentz Invariance*, J.Phys.A 44 (2011) 055402 doi:10.1088/1751-8113/44/5/055402 arXiv:1007.5505
- [7] J.Goldstone, *unpublished notes*
- [8] P.Goddard, J.Goldstone, C.Rebbi, C.B.Thorn, *Quantum Dynamics Of A Massless Relativistic String*, Nuclear Physics B56 (1973) 109